

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending, of which claims 11 and 12 have been cancelled.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,907,375 (Nishikawa). Applicants disagree.

Applicants' claims recite a method for altering the appearance of a liquid crystal display that includes providing "a liquid crystal display comprising a display module and a first front polarizer separated from the display module and removably attached...removing the first front polarizer...and attaching a second front polarizer..., the second front polarizer yielding a different display appearance relative to the first front polarizer."

Nishikawa disclosed an input-output unit that includes a display unit having a bendable display screen and an input unit positioned below the display unit. Positioning the input unit below the display unit allows for improved optics because the display screen is not viewed through the input unit. The display unit is bendable to allow the pressure from the input on the display unit to be translated to the input unit. Nishikawa further discloses cushioning layers within the bendable display unit to help prevent the destruction of liquid crystal orientation that can otherwise be caused by repeated pressure to the display unit.

There is nothing in Nishikawa to teach or suggest any of the following features, each of which are recited in Applicants' claims: (i) a front polarizer separated from and removably attached to a display module; (ii) removing the removably attached front polarizer; (iii) attaching a different front polarizer; or (iv) changing the display appearance by replacing one front polarizer with another. The front polarizer of Nishikawa is not removably attached, and therefore the topics of removing and replacing the front polarizer are not mentioned at all. Nishikawa does not even broach the topic of changing the display appearance by replacing the front polarizer. The Office Action points to columns 17 and 18 of Nishikawa, along with Figures 20-23, as disclosing the claimed invention. Applicants find no such disclosure. Rather, these sections are dedicated to evaluating the performance of various display unit constructions and shock-absorbing layers viz-a-viz damage to the liquid crystal orientation with repeated input pressure of varying amounts.

For these reasons, Applicants contend that Nishikawa does not anticipate any of claim 1-10, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. Applicants submit that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance and request early indication of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

June 13, 2006

Date

By: /Robert J. Pechman/

Robert J. Pechman, Reg. No.: 45,002
Telephone No.: 651-737-0631

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833